

special
collections
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

167

A

LETTER

TO *JONES (William)*
in Nagaland

JOHN BULL, Esq.

FROM HIS

Second Cousin *THOMAS BULL,*

AUTHOR OF THE

FIRST and SECOND LETTERS

TO HIS

BROTHER *JOHN.*

LONDON:

Printed by NORMAN and CARPENTER,
No 14, FETTER-LANE;

AND SOLD BY

F. and C. RIVINGTON, *St. Paul's Church-Yard.*

M DCC XCIII.

[Price One Shilling.]

108 80911.1793.146

A

L E T T E R

T O

JOHN BULL, Esq.

S I R,

YOU belong to an honourable branch of our family; but you have never despised your poor relations. I am therefore well assured, that this address, which comes from one of them, will meet with a kind reception. To *Brother John* I can say what I please, and treat him with a jest or two, when he wants it, because he and I are upon easy terms: but when I speak to You, Sir, I must observe the formalities due to a person of a superior station.

A

Thomas

Thomas Bull is a plain *farmerly* man, given up to the busines of his calling, and finding in it that contentment, which you great gentlemen do not always find in the higher ways of life. It must be some pressing occasion which draws him out of his obscurity, to embroil himself with adversaries of more words than he has to spare: he knows with how much trouble and hazard to himself, every man that undertakes it, must encounter publick error; and that they, who cannot answer, will never cease to rail. But he is supported under these discouragements by some short and plain considerations. He is told of human life, that the way of it is a pilgrimage; and that the time of it is short. He must therefore pass through the world as he would ride through a town; where, if the people are rude, and the boys shout, and the dogs bark, a little patience and a quiet horse will soон convey him to the silence and safety of a private road. It was also inculcated very early into his mind, that no danger is to be avoided when the good of our country is at stake, and that it is far more eligible to perish *for* it than *with* it. If life itself is

due

due to our country, every wise and honest man will readily offer to it his care and his reputation. He saw with how much industry that wicked libel of *Thomas Paine* was dispersed, and even conveyed by stealth (like a rotten egg) into people's pockets, to poison the minds of the common sort, and prepare them for some deadly mischief; how it was posted up, to be sold, even along with old shoes, and butcher's meat. He heard how the approach of equal liberty and equal property, the universal downfall of Royalty and Religion, were trumpeted about by persons affected to the anarchy of *France*; he had also received private intimations of a confederacy of a very dangerous description: and though not with such evidence as was clear enough to bring it forward, yet sufficient to alarm a private person, and convince him that some great evil was intended: that no time was to be lost, and that no language could be too strong to secure the people against the prevailing delusion of *French* Politics. Common understandings having been deceived, were to be addressed in a common way, and argued with from the plain principles of common sense and reli-

gious duty, such as they imbibed when they learned their Catechism ; and such as *Thomas Bull*, having always been used to them, could handle better than any other. The man in lower life, who writes by the light of a farthing candle, cannot be expected to see so far into some things as gentlemen do who burn wax. His first address however, with all it's faults, was received with unexpected approbation, and had certainly a great and sudden effect in opening the eyes and pacifying the minds of the common people.* But as one man's good is another man's evil (which, by the way, renders *equal liberty* an impossibility in nature), great disapprobation was also to be apprehended. If there was a design to introduce a French Government, and that design was in any for-

* It is supposed, that, in the English and Welsh Languages, two hundred thousand copies were dispersed ; and that by a *multitude of Editors* ; amongst whom there was one *Diffenter*, if not more, who printed it without correcting or curtailing it, as some other persons did ; who would probably have done more good to the Publick, and acquired more honour to themselves, if they had stood their ground. Other Gentlemen, of the same good intention with themselves, did so ; and found themselves able to maintain it.

wardness ;

wardness, and *Thomas Bull* happened to come across with his Letter just at the critical time to intercept it; gentlemen who were well inclined to such a Government would be a little ruffled and discomposed. The defeat arising from that, and other co-operating causes, would add to their former *malignity*, the rage of *disappointment*.

It was easy to foresee, that for the use of any *religious* argument, it might be objected to *Thomas Bull*, that he revives the Doctrines concerning Government, which (as some would have it) were given up at the Revolution in 1688. But Mr. *Burke* hath very ably and very seasonably taught us, that the Revolution of that time did not alter the hereditary government of this Kingdom, but left laws and doctrines as sacred as they were before. The Revolution in *France* hath abolished them all: it is treason there to cry *God save the King*: If it were so here, our *Theatres* would be as guilty as our *Churches*: We are still a *Christian Nation*, and may talk and reason, may say or *sing*, as if we were so; till the time shall come, which heaven avert, when we shall be allowed neither

neither to speak nor to write, but at the will of such Despots as have taken away the liberty of the Press in France. When a Government is to be overturned, the licentious use of the Press is demanded; but when it *is* overturned, the Press is strictly guarded, and Printers are hanged up, lest it be overturned *again*; and then we see at last what patriots meant by the *Liberty of the Press*. If we assert any alliance between the Powers of Earth and the Powers of Heaven, we must expect to be accused of setting up an *indefeasible divine right*; a sort of right not to be found in the Bible, but by those who can see farther than *Thomas Bull*. He is indeed very plainly taught, that the *Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men*; but he knows better than to expect that any Statesman, as such, will second him in the application; because this is an article of Doctrine, not a rule of Government. Every good Government supposes it; but no government immediately acts upon it; till it maintains, with the fanatics of the last century, that *grace and dominion go together*. How much worse than these are the fanatics of the present time; who do not act

under

under God by mistake, but against God by profession!

It was also apprehended, that such of our *Dissenters*, as had been notoriously active in spreading the doctrines of *Thomas Paine*; and who keep up an *Interest* against the Church, not for *conscientious Scruples*, but for *political purposes*, would be stung when they were reminded of any Share they might have in the *troubles of America*, out of which proceeded the troubles of *France*: and exclaim against the suggestion as a *libel* upon the whole body. But such an interpretation is reckoned very uncandid in all other cases of the kind; and has not been insisted upon by those among them, who, if the reflection were general, would have reason to be offended. When it is said, that the outrages at *Birmingham* were committed by *the Churchmen*, it would be very unjust to apply this to the whole body of the Church of England; the peaceable and pious members of which disclaim and abhor such violent and illegal proceedings. If Dr. *Priestley* had offended against the Laws and the Peace of his Country, he should have been punished

punished by the Law. That his Adversaries should act in such a manner as to expose *themselves* to punishment instead of *him*, was probably the very thing he wished for; that with some shew of reason, he who had so indiscreetly acted for his *own* party, might cast the blame of it upon other people. It would be a long question, if we were to go into the origin and causes of the troubles in *America*, most of which, however, are pretty well known: and I hear of a very respectable Gentleman, who has by him in manuscript a series of small pieces, composed at the *time*, and upon the *spot*, in which they are faithfully noted and laid open. As nothing of the kind has yet appeared, it is pity these pieces have been so long kept from the eye of the Public. That some of the Dissenters had a large share in those Troubles cannot be denied; because they have claimed the *honour* of it: and surely it would be inconsistent, if not ridiculous, to repel as *an accusation* what has been publickly boasted of as *a merit*. The Words of Dr. *Priestley*, in his discourse at the funeral of Dr. *Price*, are very remarkable, and decisive upon the case. “ So ardent was his zeal for the *natural* “ *rights*

“ *rights of men*, and so forcibly and effectually did he plead the cause of liberty, civil and religious, that no inconsiderable portion of the human race acknowledge his writings to have been of eminent use to their attainment of those great *blessings*: and the most august assembly in the world, by which I wish to be understood the *national assembly of France*, have justly styled him the *Apostle of liberty.*” p. 8.

To his *apostolical labours* the *blessings* in *America* are here imputed by Dr. *Priestley*. But then it happened unfortunately, that *their blessings* were *our troubles*: and when he imputes *blessings*, and we impute *troubles*, to the same cause, we are agreed as to the fact, and only view the same subject on a different side. Thus it is in respect to the affairs of France: what to us is *rebellion* to them is the *sovereignty of the people*; and what to us is an attempt to restore the constitution, to them is *rebellion*; the only sort of *rebellion* now remaining in the world: where we see *massacre*, they see *deliverance*; what we call *anarchy*, they call *government*; and what is *misery* in our eyes, is *enjoyment* in *their's*. But then this is not true of

all the people of *France*; thousands of whom sit by in silent captivity, weeping over the ruins of their country. So when we speak of the *Dissenters*, the worth of individuals is always to be excepted; and *Thomas Bull* himself will be as ready as anybody to make the exception, where it is *due*. Nothing should be marked for censure, but the restless *Spirit* of a *Faction*; which, wherever it is found, is always of pernicious effect; for *Parties* never blush; they are so supported by their numbers. A great sin is broken into small shares, so that they can commit enormities without remorse, at which single men would shudder. For the same reason, popular assemblies can do such injuries, as no King, being a single person, would choose or dare to do, for the sake of his honour, and perhaps of his life. Many of the *Dissenters* are as averse as we are to the religious principles of *Dr. Priestley*, and the political principles of *Thomas Paine*; and though their flatterers may not wish it, their friends would have been glad, if they had signified the same by some public act half a year ago, that the wheat might have been separated from the chaff. It is the misfor-

tuue

tune of every faction, that they who are *best* among them are led by the *worst*; who, being commonly clever and active persons, have the forming of their schemes, and see to the execution of them. But I say no more of this, because I am informed that a Gentleman of great abilities and equal candour intends to expostulate with the Dissenters as to several particulars of their late conduct.

And now, Sir, I beg leave to quit the consideration of *my* affairs, that I may talk with you a little about your own, which are of more consequence. From your ancestors you have inherited a good estate, which you will be glad to keep and transmit to your posterity: therefore you have good reason to be alarmed, when a *war* is declared against *property* on the supposed *natural rights of man*. Let us ask then, *who is man?* Man, in the abstract, is a being between the Deity and the brute creation; and his rights, in that capacity, can be only against God and against the beasts. There is a third right, which is that of one man against another man; and when we treat of this, we may

speak sense. Instead then of saying *man*, in the general, let us say *some man*, and then we may get forward: but the logicians teach us, that they always dwell upon *generals*, who wish to deceive us about *particulars*. Thus *Englishmen*, for example, have their rights against *Frenchmen*; and one Englishman has a right against another Englishman; and every *possessor* in the world has a right to what he has got, till somebody else can *shew a better*. How is that to be done? Never but by some law, applicable to the case. All actual right is under some law; and, till there is law to distinguish, there is no right; nor any security of possession, till there is an authority to execute the Law. Hence the Romans signified *Right* and *Law* by the same word, *Jus*. I take *Lex* to be the law as it is written, and *Jus* to be the law as it is administered; from whence comes the word *Justice*, which means the administration of law, or distribution of right and property. Hence, if there be no law, there is no justice: consequently, a state of nature, if there were such a thing, must be a state of violence, with no right but that of force, which is the right of the beasts. It is

the

...

the right a dog has to a bone, which he has taken away from another dog, because he was the stronger of the two. A right *above law* is the right of a *Despot*, who is a *Law to himself*, and becomes such by the power of the sword. A right *without law* is the right of a thief; and every man who asserts it is a thief in *theory*; worse than a thief in practice: as an *evil spirit*, being an *author of sin*, is worse than an *evil man*, who is only a practitioner.

Natural Right is a principle, which cannot be brought to any effect, but upon a presumption that the world is now *unoccupied*; or by *divesting* the present possessors, and *laying all property open*, to be scrambled for. By those who have any thing, this principle should be guarded against in time: they only can profit by it, who have nothing, or deserve nothing. Any change will be acceptable to those who cannot change for the worse.

National Right has of late made a great noise; but who can discover what it is? If it be a defensive right in a *nation* against their *King*,

King, what will become of it when there is *no King*? If it be a defensive right in one nation against another nation, it must go with the soil of which they are possessed ; that is, it must be confined to the *natives* ; and then how comes it to pass, that any *national* rights of *France* can be found in *Thomas Paine* and *Dr. Priestley*, who are *Englishmen*? *Thetford* and *Birmingham* being within the borders of *England*, how can the *natives* of those places have *national* rights in *France*? I grant they may be taken into a participation of such rights *de facto* ; but then the *Philosophy* of *national* right is either given up, or comes to nothing.

When *Man* is taken in the abstract, it is never inquired whether he has any *Religion*, or whether he has none ; whether he is wise or foolish, white or black : he is taken without his qualities either of mind or body, and without his obligations to God or to man : and then there is nothing left of him but the *animal* called by the name of *man* ; and his rights as such are not the rights of a *christian*, nor of a *civilized*, nor of a *social* being, but of an *animal* only. I have therefore

fore frequently wondered, why they who assert *rights* to man in this capacity, do not allow the claim of right in *other animals*: and why they do not carry on their principle, where it must go in spite of them, from the rights of man to the rights of beasts. For, so far as right is *natural*, beasts must have it as well as man: and what will it prove? It will prove, in the *rat*, a right to gnaw our victuals and undermine our habitations: in the *fox*, a right to take the poultry: in the *wolf*, a right to eat the sheep; for all creatures have a *right to live*, and it is the *nature* of these creatures to live in this manner. When Religion is brought into the question, without which man and the world are both inexplicable, all the difficulty is answered in a moment. We produce our *Magna Charta* of Revelation, which shews us how God has given to man a sovereignty over all the Creation; and that *wild beasts are made to be taken and destroyed*: because, as God will one day *cast out of his kingdom all things that offend*, man has authority to do the same thing now in *his kingdom*. This we allow to be one of the rights of man; but not a *natural right*, because it is a right held under a positive

sitive law: and he who parts with that law deserves to suffer the consequences, and forfeit the prerogatives of a man: the beasts of the field ought to prevail against him; the Horse should kick him; the Bull should toss him; the Swine should gore him; the Serpent should bite him.

If natural rights were extended to the beasts, it is evident, the most evil of them would always have the advantage; and the innocent, being weaker, would be sure to suffer. So if men were turned loose to their natural liberty, it is equally certain the worst men would have the most of it. This they themselves know; and that makes them bawl so loud for it: but, to prevent what they wish, is the first design of Government; and power is given to Kings and Rulers for this purpose only. As things are now, no man can possibly injure another, without offending against some known law of God: and as God does not execute his own laws in person, others must be appointed to do it for him, and by his authority, not by their own: for then the sovereignty would be not in God, but in them. This is *my* original of Government;

vernment ; and I think men never did, nor ever will make sense of any other Scheme. And if after this any Gentleman *of property* can spend his wit and his oratory in defending the principle of *natural right* against positive law, he is whetting the axe which is laid to his own root : and his understanding, whatever noise he may make with his tongue, is at last but of a size with that of the poor Irishman, who, sitting on the bough of a tree, chopped on the wrong side of him, and let himself down to the ground.

As for the invention, of which the French Revolutionists are now so fond, that *all* power of government must arise by contribution from the people who are governed, and that *no* power is legal but what does so arise ; these are very rash assertions, not agreeable to the order of nature and the sense of things. And besides, we have a principle here, which, as it is now applied, instantly dissolves the British Government. For, if *all legal* power must arise from *popular delegation* (which is now the *French* principle of Government) then the power, which doth *not* so arise, but descends by inheritance, is *illegal* : which

being the case here with the *Crown*, and the *House of Lords*, they must fall of course as soon as this popular principle shall be brought to effect, in its full extent. Therefore let Englishmen be aware, that if what is called a *Reform of Parliament*, to which the friends of *Thomas Paine* are now transferring their hopes, should come forward on the *French Principle*, it must amount to a dissolution of the present Government, and the whole system of our laws; and *magna charta* itself must go with them, as being a law derived to the people by concession from the *Crown*: for though *magna charta* was forced from the King, yet they who forced it from him, did so, because they knew it would not be legal without him. What I here say is not merely from the reason of the case, though that is plain enough; but is grounded on positive evidence. I have before my eye a piece by the Politician, who styles himself the author of *A Call to the Jews*, and who in the year 1785 struck out for *England*, under the fictitious name of *Utopia*, a plan of Parliamentary Reformation; and took the form of *thirty-nine Articles*, for an insult on the Religious Doctrines of the Church of *England*;

England ; applying to it, in a *Motto*, that text which Dr. *South* applied to Dr. *Burnet*—*forty stripes save one*. By these articles of reform, all persons *promoted by a King or by a minister*, and all *grandees*, that is, all who are noble by birth or by creation, are excluded, with *convicts* and *madmen*, from having any share in the *Legislative Delegation*. This curious publication let the *Fox* out of the bag very early : and the author of it has been remarkable for the simplicity and integrity of mind, with which he has always betrayed his own schemes and those of his party.

I would request you, Sir, farther to observe, how this new opinion, of there being *no legitimate power but by popular delegation*, totally excludes the Providence of God from having any share in the Government of Nations : and indeed they who argue for it do generally speak throughout, as if *God was not in all their thoughts*. They call the belief of Divine Providence by the cant name of *Superstition* ; a word which, in their mouths, includes all *true Religion* ; and openly declare they *must destroy it, or it will destroy them*.

But does not every schoolboy know, how many Governments have arisen in the world from the sole principle of conquest, and lasted for ages? and is not this principle, though disavowed for convenience, still lurking behind the curtain in France; where the sword in the hand of one party has erected a government upon the ruins of another party? All Europe can answer the question. When authority and power were any where established on the principle of conquest, he that gave the victory made the Government: and therefore he claims a prerogative of *putting down one, and setting up another.* He is therefore called the *Lord of hosts*, that is of *armies*; and celebrated as a *man of war*; because the armies of the world ever were under his direction, and ever will be; though *the heathen furiously rage together, and the people imagine a vain thing*; even that vainest of all vain things, an imagination, that they can dethrone God, and govern the world in his stead, by their *own laws* and their *own providence!* When the *Jews* were to be destroyed, and the *Romans* went against them for that purpose, the parable had foretold, that *the King (God)* should

should send forth *his* armies: and when the same nation was captive under the *Assyrians*, he commanded his people to submit to them; to *pray for the life of Nabuchodonosor* and of *Balthazar his Son*: even as our Saviour allowed the *Roman* power in *Judea* by *paying tribute* to it; and even working a miracle to enable himself so to do. This was a government by Conquest: and, by the laws of God such Governments are valid, though the feelings of man do not find them agreeable in theory. Strike off the power of divine providence; and strike off the laws of Religion; and then, and not till then, we may derive all Government by a delegation from the people: it is therefore nothing wonderful, that this principle and atheism should go together, as they now do in *France*; and whether atheism begets *it*, or *it* begets atheism, is not worth a dispute. Yet after all I have said on delegated power, I desire you, Sir, who are a moderate man, to observe, that I deny no more than the *universality* of the principle, as applied to Government. I hold it utterly untrue to affirm, that *all* power must arise by delegation: and as untrue to say, that *no* power doth so arise; because

cause we see in fact a part of the power of our own Government undoubtedly so constituted. I would therefore here keep a *middle path*; to secure Government from *insult* on one hand, and *presumption* on the other.

Government is sometimes rendered odious and frightful, because it provides for the public defence by a standing army. But the truth of the case is this: every Gentleman must either defend his property *himself*, or hire somebody else to do it for him. If good men will learn the use of arms, and be ready on occasion to defend themselves in person, which might be a good thing, and is already done in part by the establishment of our *Militia*, there will be of consequence less call for standing forces. But after all, what is the evil of a standing army, compared with that of a *Paris Mob*? I use myself to consider this world as an *high-way*; and the case of every Government as parallel to that of a stage-coach upon the road. A military force is as necessary to a nation, as a guard is to defend the passengers from robbers. But then an army may be an Engine of

of Tyranny ; so it may : but much worse, when it is under demagogues who are *afraid of it*, and must keep it in good humour by *glutting it with plunder*, than when it is under a King, who has the command of it by Law. The guard behind may turn his blunderbuss upon the passengers in the coach ; and so may every provision for our security in this world be turned to our destruction. Our victuals may choak us : but surely they are foolish people, who expose themselves to danger which is obvious and certain, through a ridiculous fear of that which is imaginary ; and give up their purse to a highwayman, because the guard may misuse his weapons. Nothing demonstrates to me so fully the fanatical absurdity of the French Political Philosophy, as the notion with which they first set out ; *viz.* that we should have no more war when we had no more kings. For, will there be no more highwaymen upon the road, when there is no longer a coachman upon the box ? And was ever war carried about so wantonly, and executed so severely, as by the French under their new Republic ? And were the French Soldiery ever such Instruments of Tyranny, as since they proved

faithless

faithless to their King and their Laws? Take away the sword from the King, and give it to the people; and what shall we get by it? We shall fall into the hands of a faction; about whom, all the rogues and beggars of the nation will assemble, and form a lawless power, more troublesome and merciless than any single tyrant upon earth.

Which is the best for society, a *Monarchy* or a *Republic*, is a question much agitated of late, and happy would it be, if it might be decided rather by the pen than by the sword. On the republican side, there is the great learning of Mr. *Thomas Paine*, and the arms of the French nation: for the French, finding their tongues fail them in the argument, set the mouths of their cannons and mortars to dispute for them. On the monarchical side, there is the experience of mankind; the general rule of Providence; and the arms of the greater part of Europe. To follow this great question, Sir, in it's detail, is not my intention, neither would a short piece, like this, admit of it. I shall therefore throw together a few facts and observations,

observations, out of which something like an answer might be framed.

History does not inform us, that any government of the popular form existed in the world, till the republics of *Greece* and *Rome* were generated of rebellion and regicide. *Egypt* was a great and flourishing kingdom, above a thousand years, before they were heard of. From the account of the *Trojan* war, we find that *Greece* was then divided into monarchical states: and the writers, who give a history of the Roman and Grecian republics, are obliged to confess, that all the states upon earth were originally under Kings (*Initio reges, * nam in terris nomen imperii id primum fuit.*) And what is more, they allow this to have been the legitimate form of Government (*imperium legitimum nomen imperii regium habebat*), as being the only form agreeable to the laws of nature: for every *body* must have a *head*, and that head can properly be but *one*: and when the body of the Roman State took *two heads* instead of one, this form was introduced (*more*

* Sallust—Bell. Cat.

immutato) as an innovation ; and with it came in the new doctrine of the power of the populace, never before heard of : as the world had never before heard of a body with *two heads*, but under the character of *a monster*. The State of the *Hebrews*, as soon as they emerged from Egyptian slavery, was a Monarchy under *Moses*, who is called *King in Jeshourun*. He was in alliance with the *Church*, the head of it being his brother ; and he was assisted by a *Council*, who joined with him in the government of the people : and in this we have the outlines of every good government which hath since been established in the world. Mr. *Thomas Paine*, in his capacity of a political Divine, would make us believe, that Regal Government is contrary to the will of God, because God is said to have given the Hebrews *a King in his wrath*, when he gave them *Saul*. Under what circumstances he did this, and in what sense the thing was wrong, the Staymaker of *Thetford* was not qualified to distinguish. But if you look at the history, you will see, that when *Saul* was appointed, there was no change of the species of government, but only of the person. From their settlement

in Canaan, God was their King, as he tells them, and some prophet was his prime minister, who happened at that time to be the prophet *Samuel*. But they took a dislike to this *religious* kind of *polity*, as they had before taken a distaste to the *Manna* in the wilderness; and demanded a military Leader; a *Soldier-King*, such as the heathen nations had who were round about them. With this God was offended, though he assented to their demand; because, in requiring a mortal King, they had rejected *him*: and therefore he tells *Samuel*, his minister, *they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me from being King over them*. To make our case in England parallel to this; and to shew, from the case of the Hebrews, that we ought not to have George the third for our King, at least that God will be *in wrath* with us if we take him, some monstrous suppositions must be made: as, that George the second was the Divinity of the people of England, and that the Duke of *Newcastle*, his minister, was a prophet: but this being totally inadmissible, it is preposterous to argue from one of these cases to the other; and if God gave Mr. *Thomas Paine*, who has done this, to

be an Interpreter of the Scripture to the people of *England*, it must have been an act of his *wrath*.

The Roman Historians confess, that all that order and dignity of their state, that plan of their city, those arts and ensigns of war, which, with many other particulars, were the foundation of their future greatness, were wholly derived from the authority and wisdom of their Kings ; who are said to have settled all things in so exact a form, that the Oeconomy of their state was as well regulated as that of a private family by the Father or the Master of it. And so was the Oeconomy of this Kingdom, as it subsists even to this day, chiefly derived from the wisdom and attention of one great *Alfred* ; in whom, with a character of a King, we find the Patriot, the Scholar, the Hero, and the Saint.

After Rome became a Republic, it was so divided in it's authority, that it could not act with effect in cases of any great and sudden emergency ; and therefore it retained a stated provision, that in all such cases it should resolve itself into a Monarchy under the

the absolute power of a Dictator: and every reader of their history knows how often they were saved by the expedient of suspending the authority of their *two* supreme magistrates, and returning to the order of nature, which to one body gives but one head. We are shocked when we see how they provided against the return of Royalty by every possible act of ingratitude and severity: fathers cutting their children to pieces on suspicion of Loyalty: the populace disgracing their best friends, and even destroying the deliverers of their country, through a jealousy of their turning themselves into Kings. For as Royalty was reputed the greatest of evils, ingratitude, perfidy, cruelty, and all other evils, transformed themselves into virtues, if they were practised to exclude it.

Republics, some say, are to be preferred for their cheapness; none of that expence being required, which is necessary to keep up the state of a King and his officers. But the observation is not agreeable to fact. The Kings of Rome lived upon their own territories; but the Republic aimed as much at universal *property* as universal *empire*; they drew

drew money from all nations; and their Pro-consuls were every where kept with the state and the expensiveness of Monarchs, subsisting on that property, to which they had no right but from their ambition and the power of the sword. Our first Commonwealth in England, which was raised on the ruin of Charles the first and of the people, cost the nation more money, and raised more taxes, than all their kings before, from William the Conqueror, put together: more in ten or twelve years than the Kings in five hundred. And if the French nation compute fairly their charges of the last year, they will find nothing like it in the annals of their Kings.*

It

* It has been computed, that they have lately expended twelve millions sterl^{ing} in a month. To shew how the World imposes upon itself in respect to the expensiveness of Government, I beg leave to introduce the following observation on the expensiveness and tyranny of the Republic of Holland, from Sir *William Temple*.
 " Thus this stomachful people, who could not endure
 " the least exercise of arbitrary power or impositions, or
 " the sight of any foreign troops under Spanish govern-
 " ment, have since been inured to all of them, in the
 " highest degree, under their own popular magistrates;
 " bridled with hard laws, terrified with severe executions,
 " environed

It is farther objected to monarchies, that they are productive of wars, from the ambition of princes: but Republics have generally been much more productive of them; and the man must be as ignorant as a child who denies it. How often did the Roman Republic betake itself to the expedient of foreign war, as the only remedy against those domestic feuds and disturbances, which arose naturally in their Government, from the mock-equality of the whole, and the conjunct tyranny of the few? Did they not carry

“ environed with foreign forces; and oppressed with the
 “ most cruel hardship and variety of taxes that was ever
 “ known under any government; but all this, whilst the
 “ way to office and authority lies through those qualities
 “ which acquire the general esteem of the people; whilst
 “ no man is exempted from the danger and current of
 “ laws; whilst soldiers are confined to frontier garrisons
 “ (the guard of inland and trading towns being left to
 “ the burghers themselves); and whilst no great riches are
 “ seen to enter by public payments into private purses,
 “ either to raise families, or to feed the prodigal expences
 “ of vain, extravagant, and luxurious men; but all pub-
 “ lic monies are applied to the safety, greatness, or honour
 “ of the state, and the magistrates themselves bear an
 “ equal share in all the burdens they impose.”

Observations on the United Provinces and their
 Government.

wars

wars all over the world, more than any nation had ever done before them: while the Monarchy of the Hebrews, when once settled, never extended itself beyond it's natural limits? It's powers were all employed for the benefit of it's own internal œconomy: all it's wars were defensive. But did not Rome and Carthage, two Republics, fight to the last extremity, each suffering slaughter and devastation in it's turn, and sweeping down great and opulent cities with their train, for nothing but superiority; and nothing could pacify the one but the extirpation of the other. After this, I think we need not go to Kingdoms and Monarchies for the slaughterous effects of ambition and avarice.

The Romans, by their own account of themselves, inherited a barbarous and savage spirit from the beginning. Their first King, saved, as they say, from a river in his infancy, like *Moses*, was suckled by a wolf: and when his city was building, the rapacious temper of it's people was prognosticated by a flight of *vultures*. Upon it's first walls *Romulus* slew his brother, consecrating them by the shedding of human blood. - It's first stock

stock of inhabitants were begotten of ravished virgins. From such an origin, what could be expected, but that Providence was about to shew, from the example of the Romans, what is the temper and quality of human society, when it is generated, as their state was, from the ferocious passions and appetites of human nature ? For a time, they endured the government of their kings ; and they would have been nothing without it : but at the end of two hundred years, the wild spirit of republicanism began to work, and they drove out their kings with enthusiastic fury ; transferring all the rights of royalty from the *head* to the *body*, and ascribing *sovereign majesty* to the *people*. Whensoever and wheresoever the same spirit arises, it will work in the same way, and use the same language to the end of the world.

At this time we are witnesses to an event of the same kind ; but with symptoms of superior wickedness ; because that which was best will always become worst when it is corrupted. And it is curious to observe how closely the French have followed the Romans in the degeneration of their state :

sometimes perhaps by a fatality on their proceedings; but generally from affectation and design, as pedants in rebellion: and their pedantry is such, as to teach the world that their principles are of *heathen* original. When the king was expelled from Rome, the people seized his effects, destroyed his palace, and converted his land into their *campus martius*; so the French have now their *champ de mars* upon the spot lately occupied by the bastile: but when they had emptied and razed one prison of the king, in which (notwithstanding the horrid idea the people had been taught to entertain of it, and which it had, in former times, certainly well deserved) very few prisoners were found, they soon filled an hundred prisons of their own. The project of assassination was adopted at *Rome*, when *Porfena* interposed for the restoration of their kings, and three hundred assassins conspired to make away with him: as the French declared an intention to convey death by some hand, and by some means, to every crowned head in Europe; and it was proposed to embody and equip twelve hundred men for the sole purpose of private assassination. When royalty fell

fell into disgrace at Rome, the female sex grew bold with the new fire of liberty, and have been celebrated by historians for their valour. After which example, ladies in France have affected the martial character, and distinguished themselves in the field. The transformation of monarchical Frenchmen into Republicans, is attended by another as monstrous a transformation of women into men ; and we know not which we are most to wonder at. Instead of raising themselves to honour, both have forgotten their nature, and are equally out of place. A hen is a respectable animal when she is feeding or brooding her chickens ; but in a cockpit she is ridiculous.

The doctrine of *equality* was introduced as a fine principle, when the Romans had changed their government : and their great men, who were too proud to submit to kings, humbled themselves in the most abject terms to the populace ; in which they have been followed and exceeded by the new republicans of France ; who, as soon as they had taken away the head, gave sovereignty to the members, and set the feet uppermost. In

these particulars, we see, the French have followed the Romans; but in others they have differed from them to their shame. The Romans were wise enough to know, that they could never be well united, but under the obligations of religion: on which consideration the forms and doctrines, established under the second of their kings, were retained inviolate through all the following ages. They began with the establishment of piety: but our modern republicans began with the abolition of it. The Romans depended religiously, on such Gods as they knew, for the protection of their state, and served them with supplications and thanksgivings; but the French, from all that appears, are of opinion they can better protect themselves, and seem to have no Deity left but their Goddess of *Liberty*, with her altars. No heathens ever invaded the property of their priests, or seized lands, tenths, or offerings of any kind set apart for the maintenance of divine worship: but it was one of the first steps of the new government in France to seize all sacred property whatsoever, and reduce their ministers to miserable stipendaries; dependents upon *them* instead

stead of dependents upon *God*. When the nation of Egypt was driven to the last extremity by a famine, the lands of the priests were spared, though all other lands were alienated. The Romans, when they carried wars about the world, honestly confessed their ambitious intention to make all other nations slaves, under a persuasion that Rome was to be the head of the world. The French on the contrary affect to carry *liberty* to other people—*specie socios adjuvandi, re autem sollicitante prædâ*—their errand is plausible; but it appears in the issue that they are always well paid for it. The freebooters of England would gladly carry the same liberty to all the corporations and market-towns in this kingdom, if they might take their goods and money in exchange. In this all are agreed, that they who begin in robbery must go on with it, under some pretence or other: and true it is, all power must be maintained as it is acquired. If it descends by inheritance, it has nothing to do but to maintain the laws, for the laws will maintain it. But if it is acquired by violence, it must be supported by the same; and when any new authority starts up which

the

the laws do not acknowledge, it must render itself respectable by sanguinary terrors: and woe be to the people who are in such a case!

Much has been said, Sir, of late against the *expensiveness* of our government; with design to persuade unthinking people, that if the government were ruined, the nation would be saved. If I were speaking to one of the common people upon this subject, I would desire him to consider, whether he has been taught to confound liberty of plunder with cheapness of living: a doctrine which has been offered as a temptation to many of the soldiery of this country; but, by the blessing of God upon their honesty, very few of them have listened to it. When the idle may seize upon the gains of the industrious, to be sure they live cheap for a time, though it seldom lasts long. I would also observe to them farther, that the very persons who are most clamourous against our pecuniary distresses, are they whose politics brought upon us the enormous increase of our national debt: therefore by *them* this complaint is taken up as a convenience, in

the

the use of which they mean no more good to the nation at large than they did before. I would likewise remind them, that a projected equality would be of no general benefit for two reasons: first, because there never will be wealth to the end of the world where there is neither industry nor œconomy. Many of our murmurers are found amongst those, who can earn high wages for one half of the week, and spend the rest at a public house, to the impoverishing of their wives and families: secondly, because the poor of this country (exclusive of two millions and a half which they receive per annum in the poor rates) do better under the benevolence of the rich, than they would do if they were stewards for themselves. It is the interest of the poor, that all gentlemen should be rich where all gentlemen are charitable. On every occasion of scarcity and distress, they take delight, and even vie with one another in relieving their poor neighbour. So distinguished is the benevolence of this country above all others (and particularly *France*) that some are of opinion that our national character in this respect is delivered in the Revelation under the name of the church of

Philadelphia;

Philadelphia; and the fate of that church, as there predicted, is agreeable to that promise of the Gospel—*blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.* Thus much I would say to the *poor.*

To the *rich* I say it is a low and sordid policy, which makes *money* the measure of all things. There are some things for which we cannot give too much; and there are others too dear at any price. *Gin* is much cheaper than *Madeira*: and if it be a man's object to be drunk at as small an expence as possible, gin will have the preference. Dr. *Adam Smith* seems to have reasoned wholly on a supposition, that national wealth is national happiness: With a Disciple of *Voltaire*, as he was, who thought little or nothing about another life, this might pass: but if a man brings *that* into the question, we shall make a very different estimate of things; for money, which does every thing here, will do nothing there. The expensiveness therefore of government is a topic, from which *Thomas Paine*, who addressed himself chiefly to those who have little to expect in another life, conceived great

great hopes ; and from which, our frenchified politicians have boldly predicted our ruin. But, to give it out among it's subjects, that a government must soon be ruined, is one fly practice of the seditious to effect it's ruin : as, to bring on a revolution, it was trumpeted about in all our coffee-houses by the emissaries of a wicked party, that there would certainly be a revolution in England : and we may give them the merit of partly believing what they said, because most of them know what *they* were doing to make a revolution. It was the same in France. Their busy republicans spred abroad the belief of a revolution among the people ; and I heard of it in England two years before it came to pass, and of the base artifices then in practice to bring it about ; which unhappily succeeded but too well on the ill-disposed people they had to deal with. One way of killing a man is, to make him believe he is mortally sick : under which persuasion, he will either be dispirited into his death, or neglect the use of medicine. To you, Sir, who can compare causes and effects, and judge of things with calmnes and proper discrimination, I shall confess, that

our taxes are very heavy, and the public income very great; but our taxes in England do not affect the lowest ranks of the people, such as day-labourers, like the taxes in *France*; and more than two thirds of the public income revert again to the nation, being applied to the payment of the interest, and the discharge of the capital, of the national debt, which has been contracting from the revolution to the end of the last war, in securing the British dominions, and in defending ourselves against a very powerful and ambitious neighbour. If during this period, wars have been waged without sufficient occasion, and the wealth of the public thereby improperly expended, every description of men, who have directed the affairs of this country from the revolution to the end of the last war, ought to bear the blame: and it is singular, that the present administration have had no share in augmenting the debt: they have the merit of having contrived a plan for the reduction of it, more likely to be successful, than any hitherto devised; and which will certainly have the effect of considerably reducing the debt, and gradually diminishing the taxes, if the events
which

which are now impending, do not force us into a new war. The common annual expenditure of this country in time of peace, is by no means extraordinary, when we consider the greatness of the country, the extent of our dominions in various parts of the world, and the almost universal commerce, to which some protection must always, even in time of peace, be extended. *

The expence of the civil government, though greater in appearance, is (if we consider the comparative value of money) in effect less than in former periods. The salaries of many offices are in fact less than they were. Many antient offices have been abolished; and I do not believe that the salary of any one office is become greater, if we take into consideration the different value of money.

The cheapest governments certainly are despotic monarchies, such as *Prussia*, where

* If the number of souls in Britain be taken, and compared with the whole of the revenue, how much will it amount to per *head*? It might be useful to shew this: because people have been corrupted by an unfair statement of this sort respecting the imposts in America.

little state is kept up, and where the subject is obliged to serve the monarch for any allowance he may make him. The governments also of some republics are cheap; provided they are content to live within themselves, and have little concern with other nations. Ancient monarchies, in which from usage great state is maintained, and limited monarchies, in which some degree of state, and some degree of influence is necessary for the purpose of making an impression on the people, are, unavoidably in a certain degree, expensive. It is singular, however, that the new republic in America, and the new republic in France, are forced to make the members of their legislatures a daily allowance; without which these republics would not find subjects, who would be at the trouble of giving their attendance for the purpose of making laws for them; which was the case in this country formerly, when we were much poorer than we are at present. In the business of life, there must be some motive to induce people to encounter the fatigues and dangers, to which public situations expose them: and if you wish to have a wise and honourable government, these

these inducements must be in some degree equal to the talents of the men who are employed. I would only observe farther, that many of the hardest expences which happen under a government, are not such as arise immediately from the government itself, but from the extortions and impositions of subjects on one another. Here it behoves every government to be as vigilant as it can, and to restrain so far as it's power goes, and to rectify abuses before they become inveterate. The people are more commonly hurt by the weakness of government, in suffering infringements to be made upon it, than by a just and impartial execution of it's laws: on which consideration, the people will find their advantage in the issue, if they unite like wise men and good subjects to strengthen the hands of their own government; though the maxim be contrary to some of the current persuasions of Englishmen.

I have now, Sir, offered to you such of my ideas on the subjects of the time, as are more fit for gentlemen than for the common people. You have a Son at the University, and two more, who are very forward in

school-

school-learning. Pray put these papers into their hands, that they may know how to argue for the preservation of their country. And give them notice to beware of those rascally Frenchmen, who attend in many of our schools and seminaries for the teaching of the french language, but are many of them spies and emissaries of republicans, who take the opportunity of recommending their pernicious politics to the young people with whom they are concerned. *Marat*, who makes such a figure among the new tyrants of France, was, a teacher of the french language at Oxford; and in his character but a pattern of many more. When *Thomas Bull*'s first letter was shewn to one of these, who teaches in a very respectable seminary, he fell into a violent rage, and pronounced it all to be *Bêtise! Sottise!* *Stupidity and nonsense*. And why so? Is it not because they, who wish to see this country ruined, hate the principles on which we hope to see it saved. Another of these gentlemen, for the notoriety of his principles, was imprisoned by the boys of a great school; and after he had cried out of the window for his liberty to the people in the street, they

they made him sing, as well as he could, *God save the king*, before they released him. All these, wherever they are to be found, should now be well looked to: the times demand it: and masters and tutors should admit such only as are known to be of good principle as well as good ability. Let the Gentry also be aware of their french servants: for many of them are spies.

We are also called upon to pay some regard to those laws made in support of religion; which the same Right Honourable Gentleman would abolish, who in his printed speech (if it be genuine) objected *high treason* to the first innocent letter of *Thomas Bull* to his *Brother John*. When a piece is overcharged, it is apt to burst in the hand; which actually happened, when the piece was levelled at *Thomas Bell*'s letter. Such accidents should be avoided: and it might be a blessing to themselves and their country, if certain gentlemen, of high parts, and great popularity, would read more, and talk less; that they may know better what is *true*, and speak *for* it instead of speaking *against* it. There is a wild audacious spirit stirring;

stirring; which, presuming on a supposed fear in the government to do itself justice, mounts upon a table, to inflame the multitude with incendiary speeches. Blasphemous writings are published with the like audacity; not only breaking, but even menacing the laws, and reflecting upon those who have neglected to put them in execution. Where can such things end, but in the ruin of religion? The loss of religion in *France* was the loss of their government, and the chief cause of all their late enormities.

Our nation, Sir, is now in a state of vigilance: but it must continue so. French anarchy was breaking in at the front door of the house. That door is now barred and guarded: but we are far from being sure that another attempt will not be made upon it: and if not that, we are still to take care that it does not enter by stealth at the *other* door of *reformation*: a good thing in good times, but a frightful thing at this time: because no man can say, from it's first step, what will be it's last. The *meeting of the Notables* in France, was the beginning: the bloody death of *Louis* their *well-beloved*, is the

the end! If it should please God that any like calamities should fall upon us; let all true men stand their ground: and I second my advice with a story. A worthy friend of *Thomas Bull* was observing to a French emigrant, the son of a nobleman, and of late an officer in the army, that in case of a revolution here, we should not be able to fly, as they had done, to any place of refuge: so much the better, said he; you will then be under the necessity of dying with your swords in your hands: and had we resolved to do the same, we might have saved ourselves and our country.

Believe me, Sir, with all proper Respect,

Your affectionate Relation,

and obedient humble Servant,

THOMAS BULL.

London, Jan. 30,
1793.

18 30

100
40
- 218

